A. HAIMSON LUSHKOV

Narrative and Notice in Livy's Fourth Decade: The Case of Scipio Africanus

This paper argues for the importance of Livy's annalistic notices in structuring the author's aims and the reader's reception of the history, as against the standard conception of the notices as archaic memoranda. Taking the later career of Scipio Africanus the Elder as a test case, the paper demonstrates the tension between the formal features of the narrative and the actual content of the notices. As summarized in the eulogy for Africanus (38.53.9–11), Livy constructs a narrative of Scipio's decline emphasizing his peripeteia after the Hannibalic war. This narrative finds corroboration in the confinement of Africanus' subsequent actions chiefly to the annalistic notices. The notices themselves, however, provide a counter-narrative to the main text, albeit in fragmentary and marginal form. Through the interaction of narrative center and periphery the notices thus offer a space for Livy, and the reader, to explore alternative visions of Roman history.

The observation that Livy's massive history of Rome, the *Ab Vrbe Condita*, was structured according to annalistic principles is in itself neither new nor especially revealing of the preoccupations of Livy's text. In fact, the annalistic form, that is the alternating pattern of domestic and foreign material used to mark off the consular year, has long been considered a relatively unproblematic feature of the work.[1] Recently, however, Livy's annalistic notices—the condensed

I am grateful to Christina Kraus, Celia Schultz, Jane Chaplin, Rabun Taylor, and Pramit Chaudhuri for commenting on various stages of the manuscript, as well as to Alain Gowing and the anonymous readers for *Classical Antiquity.*

1. Rich 2009: 119 lays out the *communis opinio* and goes on to discuss the problems inherent in the assumption that the annalistic structures are merely a generic requirement with no further ramifications for understanding the text. The traditional position is outlined in Nissen 1893, Kahrstedt 1913, Klotz 1940, MacDonald 1957 [2009]: 223–32, Walsh 1961: 30–31, 174–76, Luce 1977: 191–93. More recently, see Kraus 1994: 9–13 and Oakley 1997: 21–110, both on the first decade. Ginsburg 1981 treats the same issues for Tacitus, using Livy as a foil for Tacitean practice. Packard 1970, which surveys the notices in the fourth decade, focuses on the similarities of Livy's language to

Classical Antiquity. Vol. 33, Issue 1, pp. 102–129. ISSN 0278-6656(p); 1067-8344 (e).

DOI:10.1525/CA.2014.33.1.102.

pockets of seemingly archival material, fragmentary vignettes, and other minutiae left out of the main narratives of the year's campaigning and bundled together at the beginning and end of the consular year—have received more critical attention, and the polysemy of their function in the *AUC* has been delineated more sharply.[2] In addition to serving as memoranda and recording the internal affairs of Rome, the notices are an important anchor for the structure and organization of the history, breaking down the long stretches of material into the manageable and familiar unit of the consular year, and their variation, when it occurs, underlines discordant notes in the orderly procession of the *AUC*.[3] Chock full of both the abstruse and the mundane, the notices authenticate Livy's history by lending it the spirit, if not the letter, of old *annales* and establish his continuity with, or disjuncture from, an earlier historiographical tradition.[4] And in their focus on the consular year they reflect the internal rhythms of the republic's political structure, as well as mark the relentless passage of republican time, with each yearly unit replacing its predecessor in due order.[5]

The role of the notices has accordingly seemed largely organizational and utilitarian, a necessary support for the body of the text, but not contributing much by way of plot or narrative organization.[6] Such a division is, of course, overly simplistic, even if some of Livy's many dockets of administrative information serve the historian better than they do the literary artist; others, however, participate more substantively in Livy's larger narrative structures and deserve critical examination in their own right. Therefore, this paper explores this traditionally schematic material as a dynamic and more fully integrated component of Livy's narrative, taking as a test case the later career of Scipio Africanus the Elder.[7]

---

official documents; Levene 1993 focuses on religion and the prodigy lists. As a type, triumph notices are the most studied, e.g., Philips 1974: 265–73 and Pittenger 2008.

2. Oakley 1997: 57 is most concise: "*administrative, urban, religious, and electoral business* (often of a very routine nature). . . ." (emphasis original). Livy's practice is, however, often more flexible, and military and foreign matters can also encroach on the notices: see Scafuro 1987, esp. 252, Kraus 1994: 10–12, Oakley 1997: 57–62, Rich 2009: 120–22.

3. Kraus 1994: 10–13, Levene 1993.

4. Packard 1970: 260–65, Luce 1977: 84. Rich 2009: 118–47 and 2005: 42, 137–62 suggest that Livy adopted the annalistic structure from Valerius Antias.

5. MacDonald 1957 [2009]: 225, Packard 1970: 272–73. On the consular year as the basic unit of republican time: Rich 2009, Lintott 1999: 9–15, and Feeney 2008: 170–72.

6. See e.g., Luce 1977: 84: "Livy seldom attempts to show how they were interconnected or formed part of a larger pattern," as well as 191–92. Oakley 1997: 123 echoes the position: "only very rarely do we find him linking diverse events from different years."

7. This approach takes its cue from Scafuro 1987: 252n.5 who suggests that we see the notices as "in some cases . . . embryonic stories that Livy has chosen not to flesh out for any number of reasons." In her main text, however, Scafuro considers annalistic notices to be "memoranda, which are simply added to the principal story either through a temporal connection or through some other superficial connection. . . . Livy adds them to the narrative because he found them in his sources and because they fulfill his commitment to provide an annalistic history" (252). Jaeger 2006 offers a similar approach to Livy's development of a narrative through the annalistic notices, though her focus is on the recurrent mentions of the temple of Juno Lacinia near Croton.

Africanus makes for an especially productive case because his activities in the years between his victory in Zama and his notorious trial and exile (202–184 BC) appear mostly in scattered annalistic notices throughout the fourth decade. This narrative treatment alone already stands in marked contrast to the sustained and prominent account of Africanus rendered in the third decade, and might reasonably be taken to suggest the diminishment of Scipio's political importance. Indeed, this narrative of change and decline seems heartily endorsed by Livy, who describes it in his eulogy of the once great man:[8]

> uir memorabilis, bellicis tamen quam pacis artibus memorabilior. <. . .> prima pars uitae quam postrema fuit, quia in iuuenta bella adsidue gesta, cum senecta res quoque defloruere, nec praebita est materia ingenio. quid ad primum consulatum secundus, etiam si censuram adicias? quid Asiatica legatio, et ualetudine aduersa inutilis et filii casu deformata, et post reditum necessitate aut subeundi iudicii aut simul cum patria deserendi? Punici tamen belli perpetrati, quo nullum neque maius neque periculosius Romani gessere, unus praecipuam gloriam tulit.
>
> 38.53.9–11

> He was a memorable man, but more memorable for the arts of war than of peace. The first part of his life <was much more notable> than the last, since in his youth wars were waged continually, and with his old age his career also deteriorated, nor was there sufficient scope for his talent. His second consulship cannot compare to the first, even if you add the censorship as well. Nor can the Asian commission, rendered useless by adverse health and tainted by the plight of his son, and then after his return by the necessity of either undergoing trial or quitting trial and homeland at the same time. But he alone took the greatest glory for ending the Punic war, which was the greatest and most dangerous war the Romans ever fought.[9]

The eulogy traces Africanus' sharp transition from the successes of his youth to the embarrassments of his later career, and the distinction between the two phases (*prima pars . . . quam postrema*) is marked: Livy lists all the achievements of

8. This narrative has been also taken up by Scipio's modern biographers. Liddel Hart 1926: 204–21 revealingly titles the relevant chapter "Siesta," while Scullard 1970: 82–88 refers to it as the "First Decline of Scipio Africanus." Scullard treats the period from 190 to 184 BC as the "Second Decline of Scipio Africanus" (128–52), separated by a brief period of recovery. Although this narrative still conforms to Livy's overall trajectory of Scipionic decline, it offers further evidence of the multiplicity of narratives one can construct of Africanus' later career. Unusual in this regard is MacDonald, who gives Africanus full and likely undue credit for the successes in the east: MacDonald 1965: 5: "In 189 BC Antiochus the Great . . . was defeated by Scipio Africanus in Asia Minor." On Livy's treatment of Africanus' death notice, see Pomeroy 1991: 164–65, and compare Livy 38.52.10–53.4 and 39.52.9, both more generous views of Africanus' career than Livy's eulogy.

9. Unless otherwise noted, all quotations are from Livy. I use Briscoe's Teubner edition for the fourth decade, and the latest OCT otherwise. All translations are my own.

Africanus' later years only to dismiss them as insufficient to attain to the heights of the Punic war, the single formative success of Africanus' youth.

Livy's explanation of the decline, however, deserves further attention. In everything that came after the Punic war, a period that Livy elides with old age (*cum senecta*) despite Africanus' relative youth,[10] there was simply no scope for Africanus to showcase his talents: *nec praebita est materia ingenio*. The word *materia* (subject matter, or topic of a book or declamation: *OLD* s.v. 7) suggests some deliberate self-reflexivity on Livy's part, and the passive voice of *praebita* adds further ambiguity: who or what, we are invited to wonder, might have provided a greater scope for the exercise of talent?[11] The later years of Africanus' life certainly offered ample material for Livy's own *ingenium*, taking up the first eight books of the fourth decade.[12] They also offered considerable scope for the exercise of Africanus' *ingenium*, even if that exercise never quite came to fruition, bogged down as it was in senatorial competition.[13] Nevertheless, Livy's own annalistic notices suggest that Africanus either strove for or had a leading role in events during that period, not least in his own notorious trial, which forms the immediate context for the eulogy. The alleged lack of *materia* can therefore be deemed as much a problem of Livy's own making as a reflection of historical events, and as such emphasizes the importance of Livy's compositional choices for the interaction between annalistic material and the main narrative.

Livy's choices, of course, can extend beyond the basic triage of which stories to prioritize and which to minimize or eliminate altogether. At all corners of the narrative, the importance of material is mediated through a variety of rhetorical gestures in addition to textual space or volume: report of alternative accounts, a less-than-credible source, or an explicit authorial intervention can easily create a hierarchy of narratives within the text.[14] Africanus' second consulship offers a good example, since it comes at a moment in the narrative when Africanus'

10. Roman concepts of old age were fluid, and *senectus* could begin as early as 42 or as late as 77 (Parkin 2003: 15–26). Livy has Hannibal refer to himself as *senex* (30.30.10) before the battle of Zama, when he was 44 years old, in contrast to the *adulescentia* of Scipio (30.30.11), who was at the time 34 years old. By his second consulship, Africanus was 42, and so *senecta* here is consistent, though it may refer more to the commencement of decline rather to a biological age. On the word *senecta* itself see Briscoe 2008: 189 ad loc. and Oakley 1997: 464–65.

11. For meta-poetic resonances, compare, e.g., the use of *silua* in epic poetry: *OLD* s.v. 5, with e.g., Hinds 1998: 12–14.

12. Note, in this context, the vocabulary of magnitude Livy deploys in the preface to the fourth decade (31.5): *in uastiorem me altitudinem ac uelut profundum inuehi, et crescere paene opus*. . . . "I advance into a greater and seemingly endless depth, and almost the work grows. . . ."

13. On Africanus' political activity after 202 BC: Liddel Hart 1926: 204–21, MacDonald 1938, Scullard 1970: 179–203. On his marginalization in the fourth decade, see Walsh 1961: 100: "It is fair to say that Livy loses some interest in him once the Hannibalic war is over, and the task allotted him by Providence is fulfilled; his portrait does not come to life again until the possibility of conflict with Hannibal is renewed." Rossi 2004 makes the case for the close narrative parallels between Africanus and Hannibal in Livy's third decade.

14. For a good example of how Livy uses his sources to create and comment on his characters and their narrative, see Moore 2010 on the polyvalence of Livy's Hannibal.

presence is so muted that Livy is unable to report precisely what Africanus did in his year in office:

> Scipionem alii coniuncto exercitu cum collega per Boiorum Ligurumque agros populantem isse, quoad progredi siluae paludesque passae sint, scribunt, alii nulla memorabili re gesta Romam comitiorum causa redisse. 34.48.1
>
> Some historians write that Scipio, having joined his army with his colleague's, raided the fields of the Boii and Ligurii, as far as the forests and marshes allowed progress; others write that he returned to Rome for the elections having achieved nothing at all memorable.

The passage is interesting not least because it is almost entirely unnecessary. It comes at the end of a short narrative (34.46–47) in which Livy describes the activities of Sempronius in Gaul, and in which Africanus' participation is mentioned not at all. This brief aside allows Livy to acknowledge a split in his sources, but above all it emphasizes the inertia to which Africanus' second consulship succumbed. In fact, all Livy can report with confidence is Africanus' return to Rome to hold the elections and his embarrassment over a piece of legislation segregating senatorial seats at the games (both in the single chapter 34.54), a notation which itself bears witness to the inconsistencies of the sources.[15] Thus the fragmentary and contradictory nature of the notices bolsters and reiterates the narrative version of Africanus' decline endorsed by Livy himself in his eulogy (38.53.10: *quid ad primum consulatum secundus?*).

The notices, however, also suggest a more generous reconstruction of the events: a vigorous, though not decisive, campaign abroad paired with domestic, albeit controversial, activity at home. The material was available, and though Livy equivocated on its importance, he nevertheless allocated it some ground on the periphery of his text. Livy likewise offers us an example of the other extreme: too generous an acceptance of Africanus' action. This is the famous meeting and conversation of Hannibal and Africanus at Ephesus in 193 BC (35.14.5–12), an interlude which is almost certainly fictional, and is not, strictly speaking, part of the annalistic framework, but rather an account of Roman diplomatic activities abroad.[16]

Hannibal's presence in the east was crucial to Africanus' prospects in the fourth decade, but at Ephesus their militaristic *agon* is replaced by a jovial exchange, in which Africanus attempts to trick Hannibal into admitting that

15. Africanus himself allegedly regretted the action: Livy 34.54.8: *postremo ipsum quoque Africanum quod consul auctor eius rei fuisset paenituisse ferunt,* "They say that in the end even Africanus himself regretted that he, as consul, had proposed this change." Damon 1997 argues that Livy's inconsistency reflects the bifurcated traditions with which he was working, and further demonstrates Livy's "creative control" (251).

16. Holleaux 1913: 75–98 established the fictionality of the meeting, followed by Briscoe 1981: 166. Nissen 1893: 161–70 accepted Acilius' version as truthful, though at the expense of Livy's.

Africanus was the greatest general (35.14.6: *maximum imperatorem*), only to be cleverly (35.14.12: *astu*) excluded from the league table. Had Hannibal been triumphant at Zama, the Carthaginian general would have considered himself above and beyond all other generals (35.14.11: *ante alios omnes imperatores*), even Pyrrhus and Alexander. As Africanus interprets Hannibal's statement, he understands Hannibal to have placed him beyond such comparisons (35.14.12: *quod e grege se imperatorum uelut inaestimabilem secreuisset*).[17] Despite Africanus' talent for favorable interpretation of his own standing, the compliment is double-edged, and thus not only questions Africanus' *aestimatio*, an important concept in the aristocratic ethos, but it also leaves his *res gestae* implied instead of actually narrated. In other words, Africanus' uniqueness renders him especially difficult to work into a history, and this is precisely the problem with which Livy's eulogy of the great man grapples.[18]

The problem of incorporating Africanus into a coherent narrative is evident in yet another aspect of Livy's construction of this unusual episode. The conversation is uncomfortably embedded in a narrative of a senatorial embassy to Antiochus, in which, according to Livy's preferred version—or at least, the version to which he allocates primacy of narrative—Africanus did not participate at all. The conversation of Hannibal and Africanus comes down to us courtesy of a version reported by a Claudius—probably but not certainly Quadrigarius—who is himself following the Greek *annales* of Acilius:[19]

> Claudius, secutus Graecos Acilianos libros, P. Africanum in ea fuisse legatione tradit eumque Ephesi conlocutum cum Hannibale, et sermonem unum etiam refert. . . .
>
> 35.14.5
>
> Claudius, following the Greek books of Acilius, records that Publius Africanus was part of that delegation, and that he spoke with Hannibal at Ephesus, and he even recalls one conversation. . . .

In itself, the report of a variant tradition through source citation is a regular occurrence in Livy's history, but in this case, Livy goes out of his way to demonstrate the distance between his own text and that of his sources: he relies on Claudius, who relies on Acilius. *Secutus* and *refert*, meanwhile, are both too vague

17. On *inaestimabilis*, *TLL* 7.1.813–15, and Briscoe 1981: 167 ad loc. The word appears in Livy three times, and is otherwise absent from the historians. It does not, as Briscoe points out, come into common use until the Christian writers. Livy's three instances show the word's full semantic range: "impossible to estimate, unknowable" (*OLD* s.v. 1, Livy 31.34.3), "incalculably great, immense" (*OLD* s.v. 2, Livy 29.32.1), and the combined meaning of both in 35.14.12, which can also shade into "undeserving of valuation" (*OLD* s.v. 3; cf. Cic. *de Fin.* 3.20, one of the few instances of the word in classical Latin).

18. This issue is explicitly explored in the trial of the Scipios, both in Livy's account and in the embedded speeches given by Africanus and the tribunes: Jaeger 1997: 132–76, Kraus 1998: 278–79, Haimson Lushkov 2010.

19. Briscoe 1981: 165.

to clarify the process of transmission, and thus make the reader suspicious about which details are original to Acilius and which are a Claudian (or Livian) addition. Finally, the word *secreuisset* (35.14.12), which literally means "to separate" (*OLD* s.v. *secerno*), is the last word of the episode, and its placement further highlights the distinction Livy sets up between his own narrative and Acilius' Ephesian interlude. This conversation, therefore, is a fragment of a larger account, and it has a functional purpose (to report a variant), as well as a narrative one (to delimit Africanus' *aestimatio* within the narrative of Roman diplomacy in the east). This double valence of the annalistic material illustrates a wider Livian practice, which deploys the annalistic notices as fragments of a larger discourse left out of the main body of the *AUC*. The notices thus provide us with further voices within the text, further clues to events and versions of Roman history.[20]

The two sets of notices explored in the following pages belong to two pivotal moments in Africanus' later career, and though they lack the fanciful conceit of the meeting with Hannibal, they narrate more directly the disappointments of that later career. Those notices are the domestic material for 194 BC, the year of Africanus' second consulship, and the equivalent material for 191 BC, the consulship of Africanus' brother, Lucius, later dubbed Asiaticus. Unlike the Hannibal passage, these two notices are overtly political and as such a classic example of the Livian annalistic notice. Furthermore, both notices are related, to a lesser or greater degree, to the events of the year; they are neither reports of variant tradition nor archival curiosities. There is, however, an important, and telling, parallel: like the Hannibal passage, both notices are concerned with the way Africanus' narrative intersects with other narratives of success.[21] In the conversation with Hannibal, this concern emerges through comparison between generals, Africanus vs. Hannibal vs. Pyrrhus vs. Alexander; in the other two notices, the actions of both Africanus and the senate are geared towards assessing Africanus' involvement in the east, and therefore also

20. The readers for this journal point out to me that Livy's narrative practice has ramifications for the exemplary patterning in the *AUC*. I would only add that we might observe here a difference between the natural obsolescence of any particular *exemplum* (cf. Chaplin 2000: 103–105, 132–36) and the deliberate moves on Livy's part to prolong or circumscribe exemplary lives in the *AUC*.

21. Cf. Scafuro 1987: 265: "The Cornelii episodes are less fleshed out as stories, but instead form cycles of success and failure that are also apparent in other sub-stories (e.g., of Hannibal). There is nothing very remarkable in such cycles, but Livy calls attention to their existence by giving such reversals prominent places in the narrative and by attaching to them a meaning that goes beyond the simple assertion of the historical fact of reversal." Since Scafuro is mostly concerned with the thematic unity of Books 35 and 36, her example is the activities of Scipio Nasica, but she argues that those, too, can further be set "within a larger frame of Cornelii failures and successes" (266), which include the uneven career of Lucius Cornelius Scipio Asiaticus, and its close relationship to the fortunes of Lucius' brother Africanus (on which see Balsdon 1972 and Bannon 1997: 116–27). The interwoven fortunes of the Scipionic family are clearly illustrated by Nasica's electoral defeat in 193 BC (35.10.4–9, cf. Broughton 1991: 11n.14, and Briscoe 1981: 158–59), when he enjoyed not only the support of his cousin, Africanus, but also the advantage of a Cornelian consul presiding over the election.

his appearances across the whole decade. The strategy that emerges from the notices, of translating past success in the Punic war into a future command in the east, both emphasizes Africanus' interests and runs counter to Livy's chosen presentation of a figure in decline. In so doing, these notices also preserve an alternative version to the one Livy showcases in the eulogy: they show an Africanus who is engaged in Roman politics and foreign policy, and whose efforts are frustrated not only by senatorial opposition, but also by Livy's authorial choices.

CONSTRUCTING CONTINUITY (194 BC)

In hindsight, it is easy to see Africanus' victory at Zama as the zenith of his career, after which he could simply rest on his laurels. The defeat of Hannibal became a central fixture in Roman and modern cultural memories of Africanus, and a Scipio triumphant in Africa became almost topical after Africanus' adoptive grandson, Aemilianus, sealed the family's reputation by razing Carthage to the ground.[22] But Africanus was not yet forty when he returned from Zama, and could still look forward to a long career in the public eye. Roman political life required constant demonstration of one's competence and achievement, while Rome's entrance into the eastern Mediterranean offered lucrative prospects of conquest and glory.[23] Nor was internal competition lacking; along with the new theater of war, a new generation was coming into its own, Titus Quinctius Flamininus and the elder Cato prominent among them, whose eastern credentials posed a real threat to Africanus' importance on the political scene.[24]

Thus Africanus' historical interest in obtaining an eastern command requires no justification: the eastern Mediterranean had become the main stage for the display of *uirtus* and acquisition of *laus* and *gloria*. The precise moment of his

22. Exemplary of ancient perceptions are Lucretius' and Vergil's evocations of the Scipios: *Scipiadas, belli fulmen, Carthaginis horror*, "the Scipios, thunderbolts of war, the scourge of Carthage" (*DRN* 3.1034); *geminos, duo fulmina belli, / Scipiadas, cladem Libyae* . . . "the two Scipios, both thunderbolts of war, doom of Libya" (*Aen*. 6.842–43). Caesar required a Scipio at Thapsus to answer his army's superstition that no Roman army could triumph in Africa without one: Suet. *Iul*. 93, Plut. *Caes.* 52.2–3, Dio 42.57.5. Cf. Linderski 1996: 170–71n.93.

23. On the possibility that Africanus objected to the declaration of the Second Macedonian War: Scullard 1973: 42, 87, and Briscoe 1973: 70–71. The position is largely predicated on the specification that Africanus' veterans would not be conscripted to service in the east, though they could enlist voluntarily (31.8.6).

24. On Cato's activity in the period see Astin 1978: 51–77; the bibliography on Flamininus is more extensive, but see, e.g., Badian 1973, Briscoe 1973: 22–35, and Eckstein 1986: 268–317. Polybius 18.39.3 (cf. Pol. 18.43.2 and Livy 33.27.6) suggests that Flamininus rushed the peace negotiations after Cynoscephale in order to head off the imminent Seleucid threat, but Gruen 1984: 620 claims that "Polybius has anticipated events and imputed motives." Walbank's commentary is silent on the point. On Roman diplomacy leading up to the *Bellum Antiochum*: Badian 1959, Gruen 1984: 612–43, Grainger 2002: 76–163. On the "decline of the Scipios" in the period, see Gruen 1994 and n.21 above.

intervention, however, his second consulship in 194 BC, merits more specific analysis. The moment seems especially ripe for contention as the end of the ten-year gap between his consulships intersected with two significant events in the previous year (195 BC). The first was Flamininus' removal of Roman forces from Greece in preparation for his return to Rome. This meant, among other things, that one of Africanus' competitors was coming home with healthy prospects of a triumph, and against an enemy claiming descent from Alexander the Great himself.[25] Flamininus' return also exposed the collapse of Rome's already fraught diplomatic relationship with Antiochus the Great of the Seleucid kingdom, and left a void in the Roman presence in the east as well.[26] Flamininus' victory in Greece thus provided both a problem and a solution: the same return that threatened to overshadow Africanus' fame also offered the opportunity and the impetus for Africanus to reclaim *gloria* for himself.

At the textual level, the east had also become the main focus of Livy's narrative, displacing the focus on Italy and the Western Mediterranean that had characterized the third decade. The change in focus, both historical and textual, thus entailed a shift in personnel, as Carthaginian old hands like Africanus were replaced by men more associated with eastern affairs.[27] It is perhaps fitting, then, that Africanus' first significant appearance in the decade coincides with that of Hannibal, who in 195 BC arrived in Ephesus in flight from his native Carthage.[28] The effect Hannibal's appearance on the eastern scene had on Rome is impossible to measure, but his very name and association with Antiochus provided Livy, and Africanus, with a forceful rhetorical device: just as in the past Africanus alone could defeat Hannibal, so too now only Africanus could vanquish the same

25. Livy 34.52 reports no real debate on the awarding of a triumph to Flamininus.

26. Badian 1973, Grainger 2002: 120–41.

27. This is not to suggest the historical existence of "local experts" or the senate's reliance on them for determining policy or managing diplomacy; the idea has been debunked by Gruen 1984: 203–49. Eckstein 1986 suggests instead that the senate responded to the decisions and impressions made by the general on the ground, but this does not extend to policy-making or diplomacy. Systems of Roman patronage and foreign *clientelae*, however, did lend certain Romans a considerable amount of influence in their areas of conquest; Africanus, for example, had considerable clout in Africa (34.62.18: *nam ni ita esset, unus Scipio uel notitia rei uel auctoritate, ita de utrisque meritus, finire nutu disceptationem potuisset.* "For otherwise, Scipio, whether through expertise in the matter or the authority he obtained by services to both sides, could by himself end the disagreement with a nod of his head." For the issue more broadly: Badian 1972, Eilers 2002. From a narrative standpoint, however, it is easier to see that Livy associates certain actors (e.g., Scipio Africanus, Fabius Maximus, Marcellus) with the iconic successes of the Hannibalic war, but foregrounds a new set for the eastern campaign: e.g., Cato the Censor, Flamininus, Lucius Scipio, and Manlius Vulso.

28. 33.49.7: *Ephesi regem est consecutus, fluctuantem adhuc animo incertumque de Romano bello; sed haud paruum momentum ad animum eius moliendum aduentus Hannibalis fecit*. "At Ephesus he [i.e., Hannibal] caught up with the king, who was still wavering in his mind and uncertain about the war with Rome, but the arrival of Hannibal went a long way towards settling his mind." On Hannibal's activities in Antiochus' court: Badian 1959: 132–33, Seibert 1993: 506–22, Lancel 1995: 192–201, Grainger 2002: 141–43. On Livy's Hannibal: Moore 2010; on the narrative's relationship to Scipio's trajectory: Rossi 2004.

enemy.[29] Whatever else Rome knew of Hannibal, his name focused memories on the still recent war with Carthage, and therefore helped construct continuity between Rome's past and present wars.

Indeed, as soon as he entered office in 194 BC, Africanus found himself having to make a strenuous (if failed) bid in the senate, which was otherwise inclined to consider itself at peace in the east. The speech, presented by Livy in indirect speech, clamors for Macedon to be declared a consular province, and imagines Antiochus' growing hostility spurred by the twin goads of the Aetolians and Hannibal:

> de prouinciis cum relatum esset, senatus frequens in eam sententiam ibat ut quoniam in Hispania et Macedonia debellatum foret, consulibus ambobus Italia prouincia esset. Scipio satis esse Italiae unum consulem censebat, alteri Macedoniam decernendam esse: bellum graue ab Antiocho imminere, iam ipsum sua sponte in Europam transgressum. quid deinde facturum censerent, cum hinc Aetoli, haud dubii hostes, uocarent ad bellum, illinc Hannibal, Romanis cladibus insignis imperator, stimularet?
>
> 34.43.3–5

> When it came to discussing the provinces, a full senate came to the conclusion that, since war had died down in Spain and Macedon, Italy would be the province assigned to both consuls. Scipio was of the opinion that one consul was sufficient for Italy, and Macedon should be decreed to the other: a harsh war was looming with Antiochus, who had already, on his own volition, invaded Europe. What then did they think he would do, when on one side the Aetolians, whose enmity was hardly in doubt, were summoning him to war, and on the other, Hannibal, a leader made famous for Roman defeats, was goading him on?

Africanus' request here is couched in very general terms, and his nomination to lead the putative campaign remains implicit. Instead, the speech is focused on the growing threat (*imminere*) posed by Antiochus, a foreign force moving inevitably into Europe and the Roman sphere of influence (*iam ipsum sua sponte in Europam transgressum*). The rhetorical ploy, however, demands more than the aggression of Antiochus, and indeed his personal ambitions are further bolstered by his allies, the Aetolians and Hannibal, each already hostile towards the Romans, and each seeking to goad the king into further action.

29. Badian 1959: 125 and 1973: 116 argues that Hannibal's arrival scared Rome into giving Africanus a second consulship. Grainger 2002: 122–26 points out that the men fighting the Macedonian war had grown up during the Hannibalic war and therefore had a healthy fear of the Punic general. The senators, however, cannot have thought too much of the Hannibalic threat, otherwise why declare the province of Macedon *debellata* (34.43.3: *quoniam in Hispania et Macedonia debellatum foret*)?

Simultaneously, the structure and content of the sentence present the Aetolians and Hannibal both in parallel and in contrast. The Aetolian hostility to Rome is clearly expressed (they are *haud dubii hostes*), and they are the ones who summon Antiochus to war (*ad bellum uocarent*). Hannibal's enmity to Rome, which was a traditional topos of his presentation, is described not in terms of a present and contemporary hostility, but rather through his historical record: *Romanis cladibus insignis imperator*.[30] The phrase *Romanis cladibus* cannot but recall the early years of the Hannibalic war, and the sequence of traumatic defeats suffered at the Trebia, Trasimene, and Cannae. Thus Hannibal's reintroduction into Livy's narrative assumes and builds on the reader's recognition of the character and his prior achievement, but it is also poignantly specific in its reference, recalling Hannibal at the zenith of his power, rather than the nadir of the post-war era.

This allusion to the early years of the Hannibalic war is further highlighted by Livy's comment on the new set of consuls as they are elected:

> L. Valerius consul ... comitiorum causa Romam rediit, et creauit consules P. Cornelium Scipionem Africanum iterum et T<i>. Sempronium Longum. horum patres primo anno secundi Punici belli consules fuerant. 34.42.2
>
> The consul Lucius Valerius returned to Rome to hold the elections, and declared the election of Publius Cornelius Scipio (for the second time) and Tiberius Sempronius Longus. Their fathers had been consuls in the first year of the second Punic war.

Livy does not elaborate further on this electoral coincidence of fathers and sons, but Romans had a pronounced taste for synchronicity and repetition, and Livy's passing comment effectively directs the reader's thought back to the fathers' joint office, and more importantly to its date, which Livy takes care to emphasize.[31] Taken as a whole, then, the notice for 194 BC draws a parallel between the present state of affairs and the early phase of the Hannibalic war, emphasizes Hannibal's stature in that conflict, and recalls the Scipionic involvement, although without naming Africanus explicitly as the suitable commander to face Antiochus and his allies. Having established the Hannibalic war as a parallel to the looming eastern conflict, Scipio's invocation of Hannibal's name in his speech allows the reader, and the senators who form Africanus' internal audience, to recall multiple earlier scenarios and to compare the present debate to those precedents. Livy's structuring of the Hannibalic war narrative in the Third Decade establishes a Scipionic presence at the starting point of each of the two halves of the war:

30. This is also, as Levene 2010: 66 points out, one of the rare instances in Livy in which Hannibal is "reintroduced."

31. On the Roman taste for synchronicity, as deployed through consular dating: Feeney 2008: 170–82.

the father is the first Roman to offer battle with Hannibal, before hurrying back to Italy to engage him again at the Ticinus (21.32); the son, meanwhile, goes on to salvage the Roman position in Spain and then secure victory by moving operations to Africa.[32] The point of the recollection of Africanus' victory is obvious enough as *exemplum* for his hoped-for endeavor in the east, while the recollection of his father's presence and participation at the beginning of the Punic war underscores Africanus' desire to begin a new war, whether presented as a continuation of Flamininus' Hellenic achievements or as a renewal of aggression with Hannibal. The combinatory recollection of father and son thus authorizes Africanus' current objectives, and it does so through reference not only to commonly known history, but also to the structure of Livy's own narrative of the events.

Thus, if Africanus is attempting to wrest for himself a place in the Roman adventure in the east, he is also trying to insert himself into Livy's narrative of it. His speech to the senate is his first appearance in the Decade that is not directly related to Africa and Hannibal, with the sole exception of his election to the censorship in 32.7.[33] Indeed, Africanus last appeared in the narrative while opposing the delegation to Carthage that ended in Hannibal's exile (33.47–49), inadvertently setting in motion Hannibal's defection to the Seleucid court.[34] Since it is, at least partially, Hannibal's presence in the Seleucid court that gives Africanus' speech its urgency, it follows also that the change in Hannibal's circumstances between Africanus' appearances in Books 33 and 34 necessitates a change of thinking about Africanus himself—from the patron of defeated Africa to the subjugator of the Seleucids. As Africanus' senate performance demonstrates, Hannibal's presence in this second arena facilitates Scipio's smooth transition from one role to the next. The subjugation of the Seleucids can be achieved through the repeated subjugation of an already defeated enemy. Thus Hannibal spells continuity, or even a repetition, of plot even as circumstances generate a change in the theatre of operations.

The historiographical penchant for repetition is fed also by the speech's recollection and reworking of Roman sentiments at the opening moments of the Second Macedonian war:[35]

> uacuos deinde pace Punica iam Romanos et infensos Philippo cum ob infidam aduersus Aetolos aliosque regionis eiusdem socios pacem, tum ob auxilia cum pecunia nuper in Africam missa Hannibali Poenisque preces

32. For the narrative structure of Livy's third decade, see now Levene 2010: 5–33, esp. 17–19.

33. Mentions related to the African campaign include: 31.4 (land grants to the African veterans), 31.8 (in passing, soldiers brought back from Africa), 31.49 (games in celebration of victory).

34. The pretext for the Roman delegation had been to arbitrate a border dispute with Masinissa, in which Africanus himself ends up participating in the following year (34.62). Livy (34.62.18) makes a point of noting the immense power and status which Africanus held in Africa; see also n.27 above.

35. On continuity and repetition in Livy: Kraus 1998: 264–83, Chaplin 2000 passim.

> Atheniensium, quos agro peruastato in urbem compulerat, excitauerunt ad renouandum bellum.
>
> 31.1.9–10
>
> The pleas of the Athenians, whom Philip had driven into their city after ravaging their fields, roused the Romans to renew the war, since they were without other commitments, now that there was peace with Carthage, and they were already infuriated at Philip not only on account of the treacherous peace he made with the Aetolians and his other allies in that region, but also because of the help and money he had recently sent to Africa for Hannibal and the Carthaginians.

The basic structure of an eastern king allied with the Aetolians on the one hand and Carthage and Hannibal on the other is already present here, and casts Africanus' later speech in Book 34 as an opportunity for Rome to renew the war begun against Philip. The similarities are admittedly structural rather than verbal. Still, the parallel between the Athenians' *excitauerunt ad renouandum bellum* here and the Aetolians' *uocarent ad bellum,* along with Hannibal's *stimularet* in 34.43.5, is notable, especially since the object in both cases is different: the Athenians address the Romans, while Antiochus is the object of both the Aetolians' and Hannibal's influence. The intratext thus exposes the reciprocity of wartime diplomacy: when the Aetolians and Hannibal goad Antiochus to war, they also goad the Romans to reciprocate.

The intratextual allusion also anchors Africanus' speech within a narrative context that is actively engaged in debating the continuities between the Punic and Macedonian wars. Livy himself, early in Book 31, equivocates on the incomparability of the two wars while shortly thereafter the consul, Publius Sulpicius, exhorts the people outright *not* to treat the two wars as equal: Livy 31.7.8: *ne aequaueritis Hannibali Philippum nec Carthaginiensibus Macedonas* . . . "Do not compare Philip to Hannibal nor the Macedonians to the Carthaginians."[36] Thus the question of how the Punic and Macedonian wars related to each other was clearly one that preoccupied Livy, and Africanus' speech makes profitable use of the difficulties in measuring the two conflicts against each other. Seven years later, the speech seems to suggest, the situation has not changed very much at all: Rome still faces the same enemies, and the same questions. Africanus therefore presents as new an approach that essentially consists of a tried-and-tested method: if, contrary to all assertions that things had changed, Rome finds itself battling the

36. 31.1.6–7: *pacem Punicam bellum Macedonicum excepit, periculo haudquaquam comparandum aut uirtute ducis aut militum robore, claritate regum antiquorum uetustaque fama gentis et magnitudine imperii, quo multa quondam Europae, maiorem partem Asiae obtinuerant armis, prope nobilius.* "The Macedonian war followed on the Punic peace, a war hardly comparable either in the danger or the courage of the commander or the strength of the soldiers, but almost more noteworthy because of the fame of ancient kings and the old glory of the people, and the magnitude of their empire, which they obtained by conquering much of Europe and the greater part of Asia by force of arms."

shadows of Carthage, the solution is equally familiar—realizing that the same old war needs to be fought once again and repeating, rather than deviating from, a narrative of success authored by Africanus.

The pattern established by Africanus' speech, collapsing the distance between Hannibalic and Antiochean wars and entwining them into a single act, continues as Livy moves from senatorial procedure to religious affairs.[37] The first item on Livy's religious docket, separated from the end of Africanus' speech only by the provincial allocations, is a sacred spring, *uer sacrum,* a religious observance, which dedicated to the divine all crops and all animals born within the bounds of a particular season.[38] This particular dedication was vowed in 217 BC, and was due to be collected in the year 195 BC. Pontifical intervention decreed it lacking and determined that it should be repeated in the following year, 194 BC:

> uer sacrum factum erat priore anno, M. Porcio et L. Valerio consulibus. id cum P. Licinius pontifex non esse recte factum collegio primum, deinde ex auctoritate collegii patribus renuntiasset, de integro faciendum arbitratu pontificum censuerunt, ludosque magnos qui una uoti essent tanta pecunia quanta adsoleret faciendos. . . .
>
> 34.44.1–3

> A sacred spring was observed in the previous year, in the consulship of Marcus Porcius and Lucius Valerius. When the *pontifex* Publius Licinius had announced first to the college and then, on the authority of the college, to the senators that the correct procedure had not been followed, they judged that it ought to be repeated according to the judgment of the *pontifices*. They also voted that the Great Games, which had been vowed at the same time, should be celebrated, at the customary expense.

On first reading, the notice appears standard and routine, both as a historiographical practice and as a historical procedure. Religious material regularly appears in the annalistic notices throughout the *AUC*, and the repetition or instauration of religious celebration, in whole or in parts, is likewise widely attested.[39] The chronology, however, is worth clarifying, since Livy's notation here entangles the notices tightly. A *uer sacrum* was usually performed in two stages: the original vow, followed at an interval of some years

37. On religion in the annalistic notices Levene 1993 is comprehensive; on 34.44 see the brief discussion on p. 82.

38. Livy 22.10.3–4: *tum donum duit populus Romanus Quiritium quod uer attulerit ex suillo ouillo caprino bouillo grege quaeque profana erunt Ioui fieri, ex qua die senatus populusque iusserit.* "Then the Roman People of the Quirites will give this spring's produce as a gift, and the herd of swine and goat and sheep and cow, all these will belong to Jupiter, from that day which the senate and people decreed." Festus 158.38L s.v. Mamertini: *uer sacrum uouerent, id est, quaecumque uere proximo nata essent, immolaturos sibi.* "They vowed a sacred spring, that is, whatever was born during that spring, they would sacrifice." Cf. Heurgon 1957: 5–10.

39. Monti 1950, Taylor 1937: 291–96, Cohee 1994.

by the collection of the promised items. In this case, the repetition of the ritual added an additional layer, so that the second phase was actually performed twice in two consecutive years. Although Livy notes the original observation of the *uer sacrum* (that is, the collection of flocks and crops) in its normal place in 195 BC, he only mentions the decision to repeat the procedure when he comes to it in the course of the following year.[40] The pluperfect tense of *renuntiasset* suggests that the pontifical decision was made already in 195 BC, but Livy's decision to postpone the notation of it until the actual repetition emphasizes even further the substitutional nature of the repetition.

The moment of the original vow in 217 BC was itself meaningful: directly after the Roman defeat at Lake Trasimene, and therefore a poignant reminder of Rome's vulnerability. The image of Hannibal *Romanis cladibus insignis* in Africanus' senatorial speech shortly before (34.43.5) recalled exactly this time of crisis, and resonated once again in the mention of the Sacred Spring. Indeed, even the first observation of the *uer sacrum* is not irrelevant here, since the main matter of substance Livy treats in 195 BC, which takes up the ending of Book 33, is the rising Roman concern for what Carthage and Hannibal would do should a war with Antiochus break out, and the subsequent delegation to and inquiry in Carthage, which ended in Hannibal's defection (33.45.6–49.7).[41] So this *uer sacrum*, vowed at the nadir of the Hannibalic war, and observed for the first time at a moment where the narrative returns to Hannibal, is observed again and for the final time at a moment when the consul, Africanus, is very much invested in repeating an earlier instance of facing Hannibal.[42] The repetition of the *uer sacrum* thus figures as a putative improvement over the defective original. Despite Scipio's brilliant intervention, Rome failed to gild its victory with a

40. 33.44.1: *prouinciis ita distributis, consules priusquam ab urbe proficiscerentur, uer sacrum ex decreto pontificum iussi facere, quod A. Cornelius Mammula praetor uouerat de senatus sententia populique iussu Cn. Seruilio C. Flaminio consulibus. annis post uno et uiginti factum est quam uotum.* "When the provinces were thus distributed, the consuls were ordered, before they left the city, by the decree of the pontifical college, to observe the sacred spring, which A. Cornelius Mammula had vowed as praetor, on the senate's counsel and the order of the people in the consulship of Cn. Servilius and C. Flaminius. It was observed twenty-one years after it was vowed." For the identification of *Licinius pontifex*: *MRR* 1.171, s.a. 212; Livy 25.5.2–4.

41. The book in fact ends with the decision of both Antiochus and the Aetolians to abandon the Roman alliance: 33.49.8: *Aetolorum quoque eodem tempore alienati ab societate Romana animi sunt, quorum legatos Pharsalum et Leucadem et quasdam alias ciuitates ex primo foedere repetentes senatus ad T. Quinctium reiecit.* "At the same time the spirits of the Aetolians were alienated from the Roman alliance, because the senate referred their delegations, who were seeking the restoration of Pharsalus and Leucas and some other cities in accordance with the original treaty, to Titus Quinctius."

42. *Pace* Briscoe 1981: 23, who accepts Heurgon's position (1957: 45–51) that the repetition of the vow was "aimed at discrediting Cato," whose devotion "to the prosperity of Italian agriculture and sympathizing with the losses that would be suffered, was less than whole-hearted in seeing that the terms of the vow were adhered to." Cato's ardor notwithstanding, my point here is altogether different: Livy's narrative goes out of its way to suggest to the reader the synchronicity in events and the continuum thereby established.

captive Hannibal.[43] Now, Africanus suggests, they, and he, have the chance to rectify the error.

The *uer sacrum* does not conclude the year's religious docket. Having reported the censorial activities for 194 BC, Livy has a further notice of religious celebration: 34.44.6: *uer sacrum ludique Romani uotiui quos uouerat Ser. Sulpicius Galba consul facti.* "The sacred spring and the Roman votive games which Servius Sulpicius Galba had vowed as consul were observed." Both this *uer sacrum* and the name of the dedicator are problematic. Broughton lists no Ser. Sulpicius Galba before 144 BC, but P. Sulpicius Ser. f. Galba Maximus, consul of 200 BC in Macedon, vowed games to Jupiter before leaving for the province, but not a *uer sacrum*:[44]

> ciuitas religiosa . . . ludos Ioui donumque uouere consulem cui prouincia Macedonia euenisset iussit. moram uoto publico Licinius pontifex maximus attulit, qui negauit ex incerta pecunia uoueri debere. . . .
>
> 31.9.5–7

> A fervently devout community . . . ordered the consul to whom the province of Macedon had fallen to vow games and a gift to Jupiter. Licinius, the *pontifex maximus,* delayed the public vow, saying that they should not be vowed based on an uncertain amount of funding. . . .

These, therefore, are plausibly the games that were finally performed in 194 BC,[45] though the *uer sacrum* is not mentioned. If these are indeed the correct set of *ludi*, it is remarkable that Licinius *pontifex* was involved in determining the date of both their celebrations. After Licinius' objection to the vow of games, Sulpicius was referred to the pontifical college and ordered to confirm with the college whether the dedication could be fulfilled from uncertain sources of funding. The college found it acceptable, and the games were vowed.[46] In due course, the consul of

43. Africanus' peace terms after the Battle of Zama were considerably more lenient than those offered before the battle. Livy's account of the senatorial response shows universal consensus (30.43.1: *inclinatis omnium ad pacem animis*), but Diodorus (27.12–18) and Appian (*Lib.* 57–65) both report more extensive disagreement. On the politics of the situation: Eckstein 1986: 255–67.

44. *MRR* 2.622–24, Briscoe 1973: 119. It may well be that the *uer sacrum* acts as a placeholder, reminding the reader of the pontifical decision in 34.44.1–3, or that it is a result of confusion or conflation of multiple sets of dedications. The original vow of the 217 BC *uer sacrum* had also included a set of games (22.10.7).

45. In Livy 29.22.5, they are referred to as *ludis uotiuis quos Romae Africanus iterum consul faciebat.* As Oakley 1992 demonstrates, however, the passage is almost certainly an interpolated gloss, and the meaning of *Africanus . . . faciebat* therefore suspect.

46. Livy 31.9.8–10: *quamquam et res et auctor mouebat, tamen ad collegium pontificum referre consul iussus si posset recte uotum incertae pecuniae suscipi. posse rectiusque etiam esse pontifices decreuerunt. uouit in eadem uerba consul praeeunte maximo pontifice quibus antea quinquennalia uota suscipi solita erant, praeterquam quod tanta pecunia quantam tum cum solueretur senatus censuisset ludos donaque facturum uouit.* "Although both the matter and its author moved him [i.e., the consul], still he was ordered to consult with the pontifical college to see if it was possible for a vow to be undertaken properly with uncertain funds. The priests determined that it was not only

194 BC discharged the obligation. This is not, of course, to imply that Licinius had the foresight and planning to orchestrate the postponement of various religious rituals for the particular year of Africanus' consulship, but his involvement in both cases of postponed rituals is worth investigation. Apart from his religious duties, Licinius was also Africanus' consular colleague in 205 BC; Africanus then received Sicily as a province precisely because of Licinius' religious obligations, and the provincial allocation enabled Africanus' crossing into Africa.[47] Licinius' religious position could be used again to Africanus' interest in 194 BC: not only would he have known what religious obligations were still unpaid, but he was also in a position to exercise his authority in order to ensure that they would be paid specifically in Africanus' consulship.

Africanus is thus placed at the center of this miniature religious narrative, where he is cast as instrumental in repaying divine debts. The sacred spring vowed in 217 BC after the defeat of Flaminius at Trasimene (22.9–10), restoring Rome from the brink of defeat, recalled the growing concern about Hannibal's activities. The other debt, the games vowed by Sulpicius Galba at the beginning of the Macedonian war (31.9.5), ensured for its part divine credit for Rome's future success.[48] The religious celebrations therefore reflect the content of Africanus' speech, connecting the conflict in Macedon with the Hannibalic wars: regardless of what configuration the *uer sacrum*, *ludi uotiui*, and their attendant vows took in 194 BC, Africanus could emerge as the link between the two wars, and thus as the inevitable agent of Roman victory in the current eastern campaign.

The failure of Africanus' bid for provincial assignment speaks volumes both for his dwindling *auctoritas* and for senatorial impressions of the events in the east, but the broad referentiality of Africanus' speech, as well as the religious content of the annalistic notice, demonstrates also that the rivalry here is not merely historical. Africanus and Livy are both engaged in the deployment of competing narratives: Africanus aims to convince the senators that his narrative (the repetition of the Hannibalic war) is superior to that of men like Flamininus,

possible, but even more correct. At the dictation of the *pontifex maximus*, the consul vowed in the same words which were normally used for quinquennial vows, except that he vowed to put on games and gifts with as much money as the senate decreed at the time of the vow's fulfillment."

47. 28.38.12: *Sicilia Scipioni extra sortem, concedente collega quia cura sacrorum pontificem maximum in Italia retinebat*. . . . "Sicily was allotted to Scipio without sortition, with his colleague conceding it, since, as *pontifex maximus*, the care of rituals kept him in Italy. . . ."

48. The Romans technically observed a distinction between the second Macedonian war and the Syrian war. Livy reports a separate vote by the senate and people of Rome for each war declaration (Philip: 31.5.1–9, Antiochus: Livy 36.1.1–6). Livy, however, constructs a single sweeping narrative of Rome's eastern conquest, covering Books 31–45 (Luce 1977: 33–38), with each of the main wars (second Macedonian, Syrian, and third Macedonian) taking up the bulk of one pentad. Regardless of Livy's hindsight, there is no reason to doubt that contemporary actors would have seen the military operations in Greece as part of a single effort to protect Roman interests abroad, especially before Antiochus' landing in Demetrias and the official war declaration (cf. Rich 1976: 87–88, and n.23 above). In this context Africanus' elision of the Macedonian and Syrian wars is perfectly understandable.

who advocated that Greek freedom also meant an end to Roman military presence in the east. Livy, for his part, is invested not so much in Roman foreign policy, but in the delicate task of balancing the demands and consequences of Roman policy for his own narrative.

SCIPIO AND THE MONUMENT (190 BC)

After the disappointment of his second consulship, Africanus fades from view, emerging only for the brief and fictional sojourn to Ephesus. He finally returns to the narrative at the very end of Book 36, when Livy reports the electoral results for 190 BC:

> Exitu anni comitia Romae habita, quibus creati sunt consules L. Cornelius Scipio et C. Laelius, Africanum intuentibus cunctis, ad finiendum cum Antiocho bellum.
>
> 36.45.9

> At the end of the year elections were held at Rome, and Lucius Cornelius Scipio and Gaius Laelius were elected consuls to finish the war with Antiochus, but with everyone looking to Africanus.

At this stage, Roman and senatorial opinion had changed significantly from the indifference of 194 BC. The threat of war had developed from possibility to reality, and Hannibal's influence over the king appeared to have grown.[49] The election of his brother and former legate to the consulship, as well as an expectant populace, spelled an opportune moment to realize Africanus' eastern ambitions. Picking up with the new consular year, Book 37 opens with senatorial discussion of the situation in Aetolia and moves quickly to the allocation of consular provinces.[50] Only after both consuls have made their preference for Greece clear, and the senate owned itself reluctant to adjudicate, does Africanus step forward, to pick up the script almost exactly where he left off:[51]

> cum res aut noua aut uetustate exemplorum memoriae iam exoletae relata expectatione certaminis senatum erexisset, P. Scipio Africanus dixit, si L. Scipioni fratri suo prouinciam Graeciam decreuissent, se legatum iturum. haec uox magno adsensu audita sustulit certamen; experiri libebat, utrum

49. Though note 36.8.1: *haec ferme Hannibalis oratio fuit, quam laudarunt magis in praesentia, qui aderant, quam rebus ipsis exsecuti sunt; nihil enim eorum factum est, nisi quod ad classem copiasque accersendas ex Asia Polyxenidam misit.* "Such was the speech of Hannibal; those who were present praised it at the moment rather than actually follow his advice. For none of those things was done, except that he [i.e., Antiochus] sent Polyxenidas to summon the fleet and the forces from Asia."

50. 37.1.1: *L. Cornelio Scipione C. Laelio consulibus nulla prius secundum religiones acta in senatu res est quam de Aetolis.* "In the consulship of Lucius Cornelius Scipio and Gaius Laelius, nothing was discussed in the senate before the Aetolians, except for the religious rituals."

51. On the senate meeting itself: Gruen 1984: 210n.34 and 35, with further references.

> plus regi Antiocho in Hannibale uicto an in uictore Africano consuli legionibusque Romanis auxilii foret; ac prope omnes Scipioni Graeciam, Laelio Italiam decreuerunt.
>
> 37.1.9–10

> When this procedure [i.e., leaving the allocation to the senate's discretion], which was either new or dug up from the memory of long-forgotten precedents, had stirred in the senate an expectation of contention, Publius Scipio Africanus spoke. If they decreed the province of Greece to his brother Lucius Scipio, he would go himself as his assistant. This pronouncement, which was heard with great approval, forestalled any contention. The senate wished to test whether the defeated Hannibal would be a greater help for King Antiochus, or the victorious Africanus for the Roman consul and legions. And so almost as one they voted Greece to Scipio and Italy to Laelius.

Africanus' own speech certainly shows remarkable consistency with his previous senatorial appearance in 194 BC, and while the reader is prepared for Africanus' presence by *Africanum intuentibus cunctis* in 36.45.9, the senators' emphasis on a renewed contest between Hannibal and Africanus is a new development. As such it answers well to Africanus' own consular speech in 34.43.3–5: whereas in 194 BC Africanus merely hinted at a renewed war with Hannibal, in 190 BC the senate is not only receptive to the idea but actively pursuing it. But in fact this senatorial interest is particularly skewed, and acknowledges a very limited continuity between past and present wars. Where Africanus might have wished for a more central billing, the coming conflict is imagined as being between king and consul, Antiochus and Lucius Scipio, with the icons of the previous wars, Hannibal and Africanus, appearing on the sidelines for support and advice.

Of course, Livy's authorial intervention is especially prominent here, when he is giving a single voice to the sentiments of the entire senate. As such, it is worth noting that the sentence structure reverses the importance allocated to each of the participants. The balanced pair *in Hannibale uicto an in victore Africano* forms the central element in a longer chiastic structure, with the verbal play on *uicto* and *uictore* drawing explicit attention to itself, and with the king, consul, and Roman legions merely flanking the two central figures. The tension between form and content also underscores the roles both Africanus and Hannibal are called upon to play. To the extent that this war will repeat previous Roman efforts, it will do so from the standpoint of a victorious Rome. Hannibal is already defeated, Africanus already victorious, with both trapped in the roles they made for themselves at Zama. This kind of arrested progress was certainly in Africanus' interest, and Livy's prose lavishes just enough attention on the prospect of a rematch to raise expectations, but whatever narrative hopes are raised here are quickly shattered by the unfolding of events. Hannibal and Africanus do not meet again on or off the battlefield. Instead, Africanus must ransom his son from the king, and ultimately misses the decisive battle of Magnesia altogether,

while Hannibal concludes his career by facing not consul and legions, but an assassination attempt and a poisoned ring.

The notice for 190 BC contains one more item concerning Africanus, the dedication of a *fornix* on the Capitoline hill, reported just before his departure from the city. The arch, one of antiquity's vanished monuments, is attested only here:[52]

> P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus, priusquam proficisceretur, fornicem in Capitolio aduersus uiam, qua in Capitolium escenditur, cum signis septem auratis et equis duobus et marmorea duo labra ante fornicem posuit.
>
> 37.3.1–3

> Publius Cornelius Scipio Africanus, before leaving Rome, set up an arch on the Capitol, across the road leading up the hill, with seven golden figures and two equestrian statues, and with two marble basins in front.

Brief as it is, the passage raises questions of the location, context, and purpose of the dedication. The last is of particular interest, because the arch stands as the one instance of a physical monument by Africanus. All other such monuments are either reported to have been refused by Africanus (e.g., the honorific statuary mentioned by the elder T. Gracchus during the Scipionic trials, 38.57) or are matters of some uncertainty, such as the statues in front of the tomb of the Scipios.[53] The arch, on the other hand, is reported by Livy in his own voice, as part of the annalistic material at the beginning of the consular year.[54] Even so, we know only as much as Livy tells us about the monument, which leaves us in the dark as to some very basic questions. All that remains is the notice itself and its immediate context.

52. I refer to the *fornix Scipionis* as an arch throughout, in order to distinguish it more easily from other *fornices*. The change in terminology from *fornix* to *arcus* occurs in the Augustan age, and for Livy at least, both words connote an arch as an architectural feature, whether within larger structures or freestanding. Based on later practice, the *fornix Scipionis* may be a freestanding arch, but it could equally plausibly have been part of another architectural complex, or even built in to the Capitoline surrounding wall. For the terminology: Mansuelli 1979 and Wallace-Hadrill 1989–1990: 143–47. For the monument itself: *LTUR* 2.266–67. Spano 1951 argued that the *fornix* was part of a larger water-feature, such as a *septizodium*.

53. 38.56.4: *Romae extra portam Capenam in Scipionum monumento tres statuae sunt, quarum duae P. et L. Scipionum dicuntur esse* . . . "There are three statues on the monument of the Scipios outside the Porta Capena at Rome, of which statues two are said to be of P. and L. Scipio . . . ." The verb *dicuntur* may indicate that Livy has not himself seen the statues, or that there was uncertainty about the identity of the subjects. Further, there is no telling when this group dates from; Africanus himself seems not to have been buried in the family tomb, and the structure underwent subsequent refurbishing: Flower 1996: 159–80, Coarelli 1972, *LTUR* 4.281–85.

54. It is not certain whether notice of the arch would have been included in the original annalistic material. If the arch was a private building, it may well not have been counted in the official yearly data. However, the public location of the arch, and, as I will argue below, the religious context in which it may have been built make it possible that Livy indeed found it among other such official notices. In any case, the position Livy accords the notice about the arch is enough to lend it the air of an official notice.

It is difficult to determine if the arch survived to the Augustan age, and whether Livy saw it himself: the Capitol had burned down in 83 BC and the subsequent rebuilding must have considerably changed the topographical layout of the hill.[55] The golden statues on the arch would almost certainly not have survived a fire. Cicero reports that Q. Caecilius Metellus Scipio had installed an equestrian statue group of his ancestors on the Capitol in 50 BC in which Metellus had confused the *tituli* of the statues of Scipio Aemilianus and Scipio Nasica Serapio.[56] Whether or not these statues had any relationship to the original dedication is impossible to tell. If the *fornix* statuary was of Africanus' family, which it need not have been, Metellus' newer dedication might indicate an interest in reasserting and updating the family's presence on the Capitol,[57] but whether this interest responded to the destruction of previous monuments or simply attests to Metellus' desire to celebrate his ancestry is unknown.[58] In any case, this renewed interest may account for Livy's own knowledge of the arch, even if only through written sources.

In whatever way Livy came by his knowledge of the arch, he presents its construction as the last act Africanus performs in the city before leaving for a new

55. For Livy's awareness of topographical change, particularly on the Capitol, see Jaeger 1997, esp. 143–60 on Africanus.

56. Cic. *ad Att.* 6.1.17: *in turma inauratarum equestrium quas hic Metellus in Capitolio posuit*, "in a gilded squadron of riders which this Metellus placed on the Capitol." For discussion of the passage and identity of the statues: Shackleton-Bailey 1965–1967: 94 ad loc., 249–50, and Linderski 1996: 156–61. Cicero elsewhere (*de Orat.* 2. 262) preserves a joke made by Africanus upon the dedication of a similar group in Corinth: *Ex translatione autem, ut, cum Scipio ille maior Corinthiis statuam pollicentibus eo loco, ubi aliorum essent imperatorum, turmalis dixit displicere.* "An instance of humor from figurative usage is, as once the famous Scipio the Elder told the Corinthians, who were promising him a statue beside those of other generals, that he did not care for groups."

57. This may be reflected in Sallust's preface to the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, where he mentions Scipio and Fabius Maximus (4.5), both of whose descendants were dedicating monuments in Rome when Sallust was writing. The mention in Sallust further accords with the growing interest in the second Punic war in the 90s and 80s BC; cf. Chassignet 1998.

58. There were other Cornelian dedications on the Capitol. For instance, in 189 BC, a Cornelius dedicated a chariot drawn by six horses: Livy 38.35.4–5: *eo anno in aede Herculis signum dei ipsius ex decemuirorum responso et seiuges in Capitolio aurati ab + Cn + Cornelio positi; consulem dedisse inscriptum est.* "In that year in the temple of Hercules, a statue of the same god according to the response of the decemvirs, and a six-horse chariot made of gold in the Capitol, were both erected by Cn. Cornelius; it is inscribed that the consul dedicated it." The identity of this Cornelius is problematic: Livy does not supply a *cognomen*, and editors have questioned the reading of the *praenomen.* Briscoe's 1991 Teubner edition prints the manuscript's *Cn(aeus)* over Sigonio's emendation *P(ublius)* and Weiss' *L(ucius)*, which Walsh prints in the 1998 *OCT.* Cornelii bearing all three *praenomina* are attested in the consular *fasti*, although it is true that the last consul named Cn. Cornelius before 189 BC is Cn. Cornelius L. f. L. n. Lentulus, cos. 201. Upon election, Lentulus demanded that he should be given Africa as his province, but after long negotiations both senate and people decreed that Scipio should keep his *imperium maius* (30.40.7–41.9). If Lentulus is the dedicator, his statue group may have responded to Africanus' own dedication of the arch and its statuary. The Lentuli later claimed close kinship with the Scipios, and even used their family tomb; cf. references in n.53 above.

campaign. This location in the text suggests a disjunction between the form and function of the dedication, since the choice of timing for the construction does not accord with known practice: as comparison with both later imperial arches and the few republican precedents would suggest, the building type celebrated a military success and the consequent triumph.[59] However, Livy is very specific about the date, though he does not specify whether the arch was begun, completed, or announced on it; and the military context of the construction is not a return from a war, but rather a departure for it. In an attempt to explain the disjunction, we are therefore forced to look to the context of the notice, whether the immediate textual context or the broader intra-textual allusions which the arch invokes.

The immediate context in which Livy reports the building of Africanus' arch is explicitly religious. The arch directly follows on the report of the expiation of the prodigies before the consuls leave Rome for their provinces.[60]

> priusquam consules in prouincias proficiscerentur, prodigia per pontifices procurari placuit. Romae Iunonis Lucinae templum de caelo tactum erat ita ut fastigium ualuaeque deformarentur; Puteolis pluribus locis murus et porta fulmine icta et duo homines exanimati. . . . P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus, priusquam proficisceretur, fornicem in Capitolio aduersus uiam, qua in Capitolium escenditur, cum signis septem auratis et equis duobus et marmorea duo labra ante fornicem posuit.
>
> 37.3.1–7

> Before the consuls left for their provinces, it was decided that the prodigies would be expiated by the *pontifices*. In Rome the temple of Juno Lucina was struck by lightning, such that the pediment and doors were damaged. In Puteoli the wall and gate were struck by lightning in multiple places, and two people died. . . . [Reports of prodigies and expiations continue.] Publius Cornelius Scipio Africanus, before leaving Rome, set up an arch on the Capitol, across the road leading up the hill, with seven golden figures and two equestrian statues, and with two marble basins in front.

It is important to note that the religious matters follow the allocation of the provinces at the same senate meeting in which Africanus secured the Macedonian command for his brother. In other words, Livy creates a single sequence com-

59. Scullard 1970: 203 suggested that the arch was triumphal and celebrated the victory in the impending eastern campaign in advance of the campaign itself. Such a solution, however, goes against imperial practice, on which we are better informed: cf. de Maria 1998.

60. This is not a singular occurrence in the Fourth Decade. Six of the departure notices "introduce prodigy lists" (Packard 1970: 129): 32.9.1–4, 32.29.1–2, 33.26.6–9, 35.21.2–5, 37.3.1–6, and 38.36.4. Packard (1970: 80) further notes that Livy also tends to "overlay the basic form of the assignment [i.e., of provinces] with a very full report of the religious preparations for war." She is focusing in particular on the two war declarations in 31.5.1–9.10 and 36.1.1–2.5, but even so, Livy's combination here of departure and expiations plays the same theme in a minor key. See also MacDonald 1957 [2009]: 156–57.

prising all senatorial business, which terminates with discussion of embassies. Book 37 begins (1.1): *L. Cornelio Scipione C. Laelio consulibus nulla prius secundum religiones acta in senatu res est quam de Aetolis.* "In the consulship of Lucius Cornelius Scipio and Gaius Laelius, nothing was discussed in the senate before the Aetolians, except for the religious rituals." The narrative then goes through the debate about the Aetolian delegates (1.2–6), the consular (1.7–10) and praetorian (2.1–12) provinces, and religious matters (3.1–7), before returning to the Aetolians, this time as captives, and other embassies from Asia (3.8–11: *per eosdem dies* . . .). The structure of the notice, bracketed by references to the Aetolians, and with religious ritual emphasized at the outset (37.1.1: *secundum religiones*) therefore places the prodigy reports firmly within the context of the preparations for the new eastern campaign.

Verbal parallels further connect the arch with the military and religious preparations. *Priusquam consules in prouincias proficiscerentur*, "before the consuls left for the provinces," is echoed a few lines later by *P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus, priusquam proficisceretur*, "P. Cornelius Africanus, before he left": before they left, the consuls expiated the prodigies; before Africanus left, he built the arch.[61] Africanus' full name is provided, which refocuses attention from the anonymous consuls to the named individual.[62] However, the chiastic sentence structure, emphasized by the change in position of *priusquam*, highlights the similarity in the activities of the consuls and of Africanus. The repetition draws attention to the context in which the two actions (expiation and arch building) were done, and suggests first that the meaning of the arch was bound up with the departure for war, and second that this meaning interacted in some way with the religious context of Livy's report.

Architecturally, the closest comparison, both in time and in form of construction, are the three *fornices* built by L. Stertinius (*MRR* 1.328, s.a. 199) in 196 BC, upon his return from Spain:[63]

> L. Stertinius ex ulteriore Hispania, ne temptata quidem triumphi spe, quinquaginta milia pondo argenti in aerarium intulit, et de manubiis duos

61. On *priusquam* and proper names as section headings: Luce 1971: 285–87. The standard word associated with departures is *nuncupare*, which appears, for instance, in both departures for the war on Philip (31.14.1) and Antiochus (36.2.3). On *proficisci* (with the temporal modifier *priusquam*) as a formulaic word: Packard 1970: 55–59. On the alliteration of *priusquam* and *proficisci* as a reason for the construction: Packard 1970: 130.

62. Compare the notice on the consular departure from Rome for 195 BC, where only the consuls' activities are reported: Livy 33.44.1–2: *Prouinciis ita distributis, consules priusquam ab urbe profiscerentur uer sacrum ex decreto pontificum iussi facere . . . annis post uno et uiginti factum est. per eosdem dies.* . . . "When the provinces were thus distributed, the consuls were ordered, before they left the city, by the decree of the pontifical college, to observe the sacred spring. . . . It was observed twenty-one years after it was vowed. On the same days. . . ."

63. *Fornix* in Livy: 33.27.4, 36.23.3, 37.3.7 (Africanus), 40.51.4, 40.51.7, 44.11.5, 44.11.8. Stertinius' *fornices* (*LTUR* 2.267) are the first use of the term in extant Livy, and the first such structure attested in Rome.

> fornices in foro bouario ante Fortunae aedem et matris Matutae, unum in maximo circo fecit et his fornicibus signa aurata imposuit.
>
> 33.27.3–5
>
> Lucius Stertinius, without even exploring prospects for a triumph, deposited in the treasury fifty thousands pounds of silver from further Spain, and from his spoils built two arches in the *forum Boarium* in front of the temple of Fortuna and Mater Matuta and another one in the *circus maximus*, and set golden statues on top of these arches.

Livy provides slightly more information on Stertinius' building projects than he does on Africanus'. Beyond the location, Livy further reports that the *fornices* were built *de manubiis*,[64] and that Stertinius built them *ne temptata quidem triumphi spe*, "without even exploring prospects for a triumph," which suggests emphatically that the *fornices* were built as some type of substitute for the advertisement of a triumph.[65] The manubial context itself is sufficient explanation for the religious context of Scipio's *fornix*, since manubial construction tended heavily towards religious structures, and was necessarily tied to military events. However, the Stertinius comparison can cast further light on the arch's importance. As Ida Calabi Limentani has pointed out, Livy's phrasing connects this episode verbally to his account of Scipio Africanus' own return from Spain in 205 BC (28.38.4):[66] *ob has res gestas magis temptata est triumphi spes quam petita pertinaciter, quia neminem ad eam diem triumphasse qui sine magistratu res gessisset constabat*, "because of these things, the hope of triumph was raised rather than strenuously pursued, because it was agreed that no one to that day had triumphed whose campaigns were not during his magistracy."

Like Scipio, Stertinius was one of a group of Spanish governors, all praetors, who returned to Rome and failed to request or obtain a triumph, all on the pretext that they had not held a sufficient *imperium* to qualify.[67] As Miriam Pittenger has recently argued, the senatorial refusal had its origins in the paradigmatic refusal of Scipio's Spanish triumph.[68] While Scipio was both too young and operated as a *priuatus*, the generals that followed him in Spain could be refused on the grounds that Scipio, too, was refused. Thus Scipio's return from Spain offers a useful precedent for the senate, but it also offers Livy an intratextual benchmark from which to develop this recurring set of triumphal questions.

64. On manubial construction more generally: Pietilä-Castrèn 1987, Orlin 1997.

65. The triumphal context of the buildings would also partially explain the choice of locations for the *fornices* along the triumphal route. The route, however, was not yet codified in the mid-Republic, and processions had some variations.

66. Calabi Limentani 1982: 125.

67. See Richardson 1975: 50–63 for the triumph as a consular preserve and its extension to praetorian governors, particularly those serving in Spain.

68. Pittenger 2008: 58–59.

Thus the connection between the Stertinius passage and Africanus' return from Spain has interesting consequences for a consideration of Africanus' arch. The *fornices* of Stertinius comprise a clear precedent for the type of construction, and Livy's verbal parallels might further suggest that Stertinius himself was alluding to previous instances of an appeal for a triumph, perhaps specifically to Africanus' return from the same province. But while Stertinius' arches reach thematically backwards, to Scipio's return from Spain, they reach forward intratextually, to Scipio's departure to the east and the construction of his arch. Africanus' building project is therefore already implicated in the moment of his first major success, his return from Spain, as well as his first senatorial rebuff. The Spanish context is an appealing foil for this moment in the Antiochean war, marking the beginning of a new phase of the conflict, in which Africanus will once again face and defeat Hannibal, and thereby end the war. This is not, of course, to suggest that the arch was in reality built in commemoration of a youthful campaign two decades in the past, though the possibility cannot be ruled out, knowing as little as we do about the arch and its physical context. More important is the arch's literary location, in which it functions as an intratextual node connecting past and present instances of a similar historiographical moment. Livy's notice of it leaves the reader to piece together the narrative of Africanus' attempts at recapturing glory, a task made purposefully more difficult by its relegation to the history's footnotes.

CONCLUSION: MARGINAL HISTORY

It is possible, and certainly tempting, to see the narrative of the *AUC* as simply following the contours of history, conforming by and large to the form of Africanus' eulogy: youthful military success, followed by much reduced success at home, which could not be redeemed even by the censorship or second consulship or the *legatio* to Greece. This is, of course, the judgment of hindsight, but it is fitting too in that it leads to the climax (or rather anticlimax) of the Scipionic Trials, an episode particularly expressive of the difficulty, for both author and characters, of constructing narratives of the past. Most importantly, it provides a suitably ignominious ending to a trajectory of decline that had begun much earlier.

Such an interpretation, however, largely ignores the role of Livy himself in influencing and shaping his text, nor does it acknowledge the authority narrative lends to the authorial choices that formed it.[69] For, as the annalistic notices themselves demonstrate, Africanus was far from a willing participant in his own decline. Too successful in battle to be removed altogether from the plot of history, and not proficient enough in domestic politics to maintain his position at the center of events, he nevertheless finds a stage at the margins, attempting repeatedly to reanimate his own waning influence. At one level, then, the annalistic notices enact precisely the sort of decline that the eulogy encourages us to see in Africanus'

69. For narrative as an authorizing form, see, e.g., White 1980.

later career. But the preoccupations of the eulogy, it should also be noted, are not in fact those of Livy's annalistic notices: where the eulogy focuses on the embarrassments of his son's ransom, his own illness, and the ignominy of the trials, the notices are focused on senatorial business, and portray a more active and vigorous Africanus, casting himself in the triumphant role he has always played.[70] And in this sense they also write a counter-narrative to that of the eulogy, showing Africanus the senator at the expense of Africanus the general.

Thus the annalistic notices have a larger role to play in the construction of this particular narrative. Rather than easily separable memoranda, they can instead provide an important counterbalance to the main narrative, while at the same time corroborating it through their very marginality. Africanus' later career is thus played out on the margins of the text and in its footnotes, and as such is reduced to a supporting role in the *AUC*'s text. Like most marginalia, however, Livy's annalistic notices carry out their own miniature narratives, deliberately fragmented and carefully delineated from the main action of the text, and they expose not only the process of research, but also the ongoing conversation heard behind the work's dominant monologue.[71]

University of Texas at Austin
ayelet.haimsonlushkov@austin.utexas.edu

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Astin, A. 1978. *Cato the Censor*. New York.
Badian, E. 1959. "Rome and Antiochus the Great: A Study in Cold War." *CP* 54: 81–99.
———. 1972. *Foreign Clientelae (264–70* BC*)*. Oxford.
———. 1973. *Titus Quinctius Flamininus: Philhellinism and Realpolitik*. Cincinnati.
Balsdon, J. P. V. D. 1965. *The Romans*. London.
———. 1972. "Lucius Scipio: A Salvage Operation." *Historia* 21: 224–34.
Bannon, C. 1997. *The Brothers of Romulus*. Princeton.
Briscoe, J. 1973. *A Commentary on Livy. Books XXXI-XXXIII*. Oxford.
———. 1981. *A Commentary on Livy*. *Books XXXIV-XXXVII*. Oxford.
———. 2008. *A Commentary on Livy. Books 38–40*. Oxford.
Broughton, T. R. S. 1991. *Candidates Defeated in Roman Elections: Some Ancient Roman "Also-Rans."* Philadelphia.
Calabi Limentani, I. 1982. "I fornices di Stertinio e di Scipione nel racconto di Livio." In M. Sordi, ed., *Politica e religione nel primo scontro tra Rome e l'Oriente*, 123- 35. Milan.
Chaplin, J. D. 2000. *Livy's Exemplary History*. Oxford.
Chaplin, J. D., and C. S. Kraus, eds. 2009. *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Livy*. Oxford.

70. This rhetoric, in fact, remains characteristic of Africanus right down to his own defence in the trials; cf. Haimson Lushkov 2010: 111–13.

71. On footnotes: Grafton 1997: 232–33.

Chassignet, M. 1998. "La deuxième guerre punique dans l'historiographie romaine: Fixation et evaluation d'une tradition." In J-M. David, ed., *Valeurs et Mémoirs à Rome*, 55–72. Strasbourg.
Coarelli, F. 1972. "Il Sepolcro degli Scipioni." *DialArch* 6: 36–106.
Cohee, P. 1994. "Instauratio sacrorum." *Hermes* 122: 451–68.
Damon, C. 1997. "From Source to *Sermo*: Narrative Technique in Livy 34.54.4–8." *AJP* 118: 251–66.
de Maria, S. 1998. *Gli Archi Onorari di Roma e dell'Italia Romana*. Rome.
Eckstein, A. 1986. *Senate and General: Individual Decision Making and Roman Foreign Relations, 264–194* BC. Berkeley.
Eilers, C. 2002. *Roman Patrons of Greek Cities*. Oxford.
Feeney, D. 2008. *Caesar's Calendar: Ancient Time and the Beginning of History*. Berkeley.
Flower, H. 1996. *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*. Oxford.
Ginsburg, J. 1981. *Tradition and Theme in the Annals of Tacitus*. New York.
Grafton, A. 1997. *The Footnote: A Curious History.* Cambridge, Mass.
Grainger, J. 2002. *The Roman War of Antiochos the Great*. Leiden.
Gruen, E. 1984. *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome.* 2 vols. Berkeley.
———. 1994. "The Fall of the Scipios." In I. Malkin and Z. Rubinsohn, eds., *Leaders and Masses in the Roman World: Studies in Honor of Zvi Yavetz*, 59–91. Leiden.
Haimson Lushkov, A. 2010. "Intertextuality and Source Criticism in the Scipionic Trials." In Polleichtner, 93–133. Trier.
Heurgon, J. 1957. *Trois études sur le "Ver Sacrum*." Bruxelles.
Hinds, S. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry.* Cambridge.
Holleaux, M. 1913. "L'entretien de Scipion l'Africain et d'Hannibal." *Hermes* 48: 75–98.
Jaeger, M. 1997. *Livy's Written Rome*. Ann Arbor.
———. 2006. "Livy, Hannibal's Monument, and the Temple of Juno at Croton." *TAPA* 136: 389–414.
Kahrstedt, U. 1913. *Die Annalistik von Livius, B. XXXI-XLV: Vorschläge und Versuche.* Berlin.
Klotz, A. 1940. *Livius und seine Vorgänger*. Amsterdam.
Kraus, C. S. 1994. *Livy. Ab Urbe Condita Book VI*. Cambridge.
———. 1998. "Repetition and Empire in the *Ab Urbe Condita.*" In P. Knox and C. Foss, eds., *Style and Tradition: Studies in Honor of Wendell Clausen*, 264–83. Stuttgart.
Lancel, S. 1995. *Hannibal*. Oxford.
Levene, D. 1993. *Religion in Livy.* Leiden.
———. 2010. *Livy on the Hannibalic War*. Oxford.
Liddel Hart, B. H. 1926. *Scipio Africanus*: *Greater than Napoleon*. New York.
Linderski, J. 1996. "Q. Scipio Imperator." In idem, ed., *Imperium sine fine: T. Robert S. Broughton and the Roman Republic*, 145–86. Stuttgart.
Lintott, A. 1999. *The Constitution of the Roman Republic*. Oxford.
Luce, T. J. 1971. "Design and Structure in Livy: 5.32–55." *TAPA* 102: 265–302.
———. 1977. *Livy: The Composition of his History*. Princeton.
MacDonald, A. H. 1938. "Scipio Africanus and Roman Politics in the Second Century BC." *JRS* 28: 153–64.
———. 1965. "Pre-Revolutionary Rome." In Balsdon, 5–28. London.

———. 1957 [2009]. "The Style of Livy." Reprinted in Chaplin and Kraus, 222–59. Oxford.
Mansuelli, G. A., ed. 1979. *Studi sull'arco onorario romano*. Rome.
Monti, A. 1950. "Instauratio ludorum." *RAAN* 25: 153–79.
Moore, T. 2010. "Livy's Hannibal and the Roman Tradition." In Polleichtner, 135–68. Trier.
Nissen, H. 1893. *Kritische Untersuchungen über Quellen der vierten und fünften Dekade des Livius*. Berlin.
Oakley, S. 1992. "Livy and Clodius Licinius." *CQ* 42: 547–51.
———. 1997. *A Commentary on Livy: Books 6–10.* Vol. 1. Oxford.
Orlin, E. 1997. *Temples, Religion, and Politics in the Roman Republic*. Leiden.
Packard, J. P. 1970. *Official Notices in Livy's Fourth Decade: Style and Treatment*. Diss. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
Parkin, T. 2003. *Old Age in the Roman World*. Baltimore.
Philips, J. 1974. "Form and Language in Livy's Triumph Notices." *CP* 69: 265–73.
Pietilä-Castrèn, L. 1987. *Magnificentia publica: The Victory Monuments of the Roman Generals in the Era of the Punic Wars*. Helsinki.
Pittenger, M. 2008. *Contested Triumphs. Politics, Pageantry, and Performance in Livy's Republican Rome*. Berkeley.
Polleichtner, W., ed. 2010. *Livy and Intertextuality.* Trier.
Pomeroy, A. 1991. *The Appropriate Comment: Death Notices in the Ancient Historians*. Studien zur klassischen Philologie 58.
Rich, J. 1976. *Declaring War in the Roman Republic in the Period of Transmarine Expansion.* Bruxelles.
———. 2005. "Valerius Antias and the Construction of the Roman Past." *BICS* 42: 137–62.
———. 2009. "Structuring Roman History: The Consular Year and the Roman Historical Tradition." In Chaplin and Kraus, 118–47. Oxford.
Richardson, L. 1975. "The Triumph, the Praetors and the Senate in the Early Second Century BC." *JRS* 65: 50–63.
Rossi, A. 2004. "Parallel Lives: Hannibal and Scipio in Livy's Third Decade." *TAPA* 134: 359–81.
Scafuro, A. 1987. "Pattern, Theme and Historicity in Livy Books 35 and 36." *CA)* 6: 249–85.
Scullard, H. H. 1970. *Scipio Africanus: Soldier and Politician.* Ithaca.
———. 1973. *Roman Politics, 220–150 B.C.* 2nd ed. Oxford.
Seibert, J. 1993. *Forschungen zu Hannibal*. Darmstadt.
Shackleton-Bailey, D. R. 1965–1967. *Cicero's Letters to Atticus*. Cambridge.
Spano, G. 1951. "L'arco trionfale di P. Cornelio Scipione Africano." *MemLinc* 8: 173-205.
Taylor, L. R. 1937. "The Opportunities for Dramatic Performances in the Time of Plautus and Terence." *TAPA* 68: 284–304.
Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1989–1990. "Roman Arches and Greek Honours: The Language of Power at Rome." *PCPS* 36: 143–81.
Walsh, P. G. 1961. *Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods*. Cambridge.
White, H. 1980. "The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality." *Critical Inquiry* 7: 5–27.